

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 were pending and presented for examination and in this application. In a Final Office action dated March 21, 2006, claims 1-21 were rejected. Applicant thanks Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and addresses Examiner's comments below.

Applicant is amending claims 1, 7, and 14 in this Amendment and Response. These changes are believed not to introduce new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. In making these amendments, Applicant has not and does not concede that the subject matter of such claims was in fact disclosed or taught by the cited prior art. Rather, Applicant reserves the right to pursue such protection at a later point in time and merely seeks to pursue protection for the subject matter presented in this submission.

In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102(b) in View of Getting Started with RealPublisher, Version 5.1

In the 2nd paragraph of the Office action, Examiner rejects claims 14-20 under 35 USC § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Getting Started with RealPublisher, Version 5.1, (Software Manual, 12-2-1998) ("RealPublisher"). This rejection is now traversed.

As amended, Claim 14 recites, *inter alia*, the following:

storing a video token in a database *at a location remote from the user
and from the media vault*, wherein the video token is associated with

the video data *and indicates the video data is associated with a web page.* (emphasis added)

These claimed features allow for fast and efficient access and retrieval of video data by placing video tokens containing information about media files in a centralized location and storing the relationship between the video data and the web page that uses the video data. Thus, the video token beneficially provides a way to efficiently access and display the video data.

RealPublisher fails to disclose the claimed invention. For example, the claimed feature recited above is not disclosed. RealPublisher discloses creating a web page “in the specified directory, with an associated metafile containing information about your media file.” *See* RealPublisher p. 29, Item #12. The “metafile” points to the location where the media file resides and is required for the mediafile to stream. *See* RealPublisher p. 30. Therefore, rather than “storing a video token in a database at a location remote from the user and from the media vault,” as recited in amended claim 1, RealPublisher discloses metafiles that “reside on your local hard drive and point to files on your local file system.” *See* RealPublisher p. 30 (emphasis added). Thus, RealPublisher does not disclose “storing a video token in a database at a location remote from the user and from the media vault.”

As amended, claim 14 recites “the video token is associated with the video data and indicates the video data is associated with a web page.” The metafiles disclosed in RealPublisher merely “point to the location where your media file actually resides.” *See* RealPublisher p. 30. The metafiles disclosed in RealPublisher specify a media file location, but do not specify an association between the video data and a web page. In RealPublisher, a web page uses the metafile to determine the location of the media files, so the metafile does not specify the web page that uses the media file. Thus, a user cannot use the metafile to

access both the video data and the web page that uses the video data. In contrast, amended claim 14 enables a user to determine both web page and appropriate media file using only the video token, which “indicates the video data is associated with a web page.” Enabling the video token to indicate that video data is associated with a web page beneficially allows web site operators to quickly determine if a web page is video enabled.

Based on the above Amendments and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least these reasons claim 14 is patentably distinguishable over the cited reference. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

As to the dependent claims, because claims 15-20 are dependent on claim 14, all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 14 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claims 15-20.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) in View of U.S. Patent No. 6,173,317

Chadda and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0040475

In the 4th paragraph of the Office action, Examiner rejects claims 1-13 and 21 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,173,317 (“Chadda”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0040475 (“Yap”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As amended, claim 1 now recites, *inter alia*, the following:

storing a video token into a database in response to the received video data, the video token associated with the video data in the media vault *and indicating the video data is associated with a web page.* (emphasis added)

Chadda, as examiner notes, does not disclosed the claimed feature of “storing a video token into a database in response to the received video data.”

Yap does not disclose the claimed feature “the video token associated with the video data in the media vault and indicating the video data is associated with a web page.” In contrast, Yap discloses a DVR system where recorded video data is stored and accessed through a file manager. The system in Yap may have a database entry for recorded content that identifies where the content is stored; however, the system does not contain the claimed element of a video token “indicating the video data is associated with a web page.” *See Yap*, Para. 126-127. Yap does not disclose a video token that indicates a web page is associated with the video data, the file manager in Yap only stores information that identifies the memory device containing the recorded content, not whether the recorded content is associated with a web page. *See Yap*, Para. 127. Thus, Yap fails to disclose the claimed features.

Further, there appears to be no suggestion or teaching in either Yap or Chadda to combine the references. Chadda discloses using annotation streams and a table of contents to allow client computers to access video data on a server. *See Chadda* col. 7, lines 45-59. While Yap discloses managing recorded content using a database describing the recorded content and the memory device containing the recorded content. *See Yap*, Para. 126. There is no suggestion in either reference that the annotation streams in Chadda are suitable for being managed by a database. However, even if the two references arguably could be combined together, at best the combined disclosure would be providing a database of recorded content indicating which memory device contains the recorded content. This does not disclose the claimed element of storing a video token in a database, “the video

token...indicating the video data is associated with a web page.” Hence, for at least this reason, the combination of these references fails to disclose the claimed invention.

The combination of Chadda and Yap likewise fails to disclose or suggest the claimed element of storing a video token indicating the video data is associated with a web page in a database. As discussed above, the claimed video token “indicating the video data is associated with a web page” and database storing such video tokens are not disclosed in either reference. Thus, alone or in combination, Chadda and Yap do not disclose the claimed element of:

storing a video token into a database in response to the received video data, the video token associated with the video data in the media vault and indicating the video data is associated with a web page.

Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

As to the dependent claims, because claims 2-6 and 21 are dependent on claim 1, all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 1 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claims 2-6 and 21.

Claim 7 also recites:

storing a video token in a database at a location remote from the user and from the media vault, wherein the video token is associated with the video data *and indicates the video data is associated with a web page.* (emphasis added)

Therefore, all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 1 apply to claim 14 and all claims dependent on claim 7.

Therefore, based on the above Amendment and the Remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claims 1, 7 and 14, as well as their respective dependencies, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-21, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references (including references cited, but not applied). Therefore, Applicant requests reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicant respectfully invites Examiner to contact Applicant's representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Date: MAY 22, 2006

By: _____

Respectfully Submitted,
GEORGES AUBERGER



Rajiv P. Patel, Attorney of Record
Registration No. 39,327
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7607
Fax: (650) 938-5200